	Case 5:12-cv-00873-LHK	Document 46	Filed 02/07/13	Page 1 of 4
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
10	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
11	EDWARD T. FURNACE,	) N	o. C 12-0873 LHF	ζ(PR)
12	Plaintiff,		RDER OF SERVI	
13	v.	) D	) ORDER DIRECTING ) DEFENDANTS TO FILE	
14	G. GIURBINO, et al.,	) N	ISPOSITIVE MO OTICE REGARD	
15	Defendants.	) M	IOTION	
16	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding <i>pro se</i> , filed a second amended civil rights			
17	complaint against prison officials at Salinas Valley State Prison pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.			
18				
19	For the reasons stated below, the Court and orders service upon the Defendant G. Giurbino, the			
20	only named Defendant not yet served.			
21	A. Standard of Review  A federal court must conduct a preliminary screening in any case in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In its review, the Court must identify any cognizable claims and dismiss any claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted or seek monetary relief from a Defendant who is immune from such relief. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1), (2). Pro se pleadings must, however, be liberally construed. See Balistreri v.  Order of Service; Directing Defendants to File Dispositive Motion or Notice Regarding Such Motion G:PRO-SE\SJ.LHK\CR.12\Furnace873\stry2.wpd			
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

Pacifica Police Dep't., 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1988).

To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. *See West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

## B. <u>Legal Claims</u>

Plaintiff alleges that he has been improperly assigned to the Secured Housing Unit for an indefinite amount of time. Plaintiff claims that Defendants Martinez and Valdez, Institutional Gang Investigators, retaliated against him for litigating an unrelated federal case, *Furnace v*. *Evans*, No. 06-4229 MMC (PR), by initiating a gang validation procedure. According to Plaintiff, Valdez and Martinez proffered that they had evidence linking Plaintiff to the Black Guerrilla Family ("BGF") prison gang. Defendants K. Berkler, R.S. Marquez, and E.W. Fischer ultimately validated Plaintiff as an active member of the BGF. Plaintiff argues that the evidence used to validate him was insufficient. Plaintiff also alleges that Defendant Giurbino is liable as a supervisor. Liberally construed, Plaintiff has stated cognizable claims of a right against retaliation, violations of his right to due process and the Equal Protection Clause, and a violation of his First Amendment rights.

To the extent Plaintiff claims that Defendants violated the Eighth Amendment, that claim is DISMISSED for failure to state a claim. An indeterminate sentence in administrative segregation, without more, does not constitute cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the Eighth Amendment. *See Anderson v. County of Kern*, 45 F.3d 1310, 1315-16 (9th Cir. 1995) (no contact with any other inmate in administrative segregation, either for exercise, day room access or otherwise not cruel and unusual punishment); *Toussaint v. Yockey*, 722 F.2d 1490, 1494 n.6 (9th Cir. 1984) (more than usual hardships associated with administrative segregation required to state Eighth Amendment claim).

## **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the Court hereby orders as follows:

1. The Clerk of the Court shall mail a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of

8

6

11

1213

15

16

14

17 18

1920

2122

23

2425

26

27

28

Service of Summons, two copies of the Waiver of Service of Summons, a copy of the second amended complaint and all attachments thereto (docket no. 43), and a copy of this Order to **Director G. Giurbino** at **the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.** 

The Clerk of the Court shall also mail a courtesy copy of the second amended complaint and a copy of this Order to the California Attorney General's Office. Additionally, the Clerk shall mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff.

- 2. Defendant Giurbino cautioned that Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires them to cooperate in saving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and complaint. Pursuant to Rule 4, if Defendant Giurbino, after being notified of this action and asked by the Court, on behalf of Plaintiff, to waive service of the summons, fail to do so, they will be required to bear the cost of such service unless good cause be shown for their failure to sign and return the waiver form. If service is waived, this action will proceed as if Defendant Giurbino had been served on the date that the waiver is filed, except that pursuant to Rule 12(a)(1)(B), Defendant Giurbino will not be required to serve and file an answer before sixty (60) days from the date on which the request for waiver was sent. (This allows a longer time to respond than would be required if formal service of summons is necessary.) Defendant Giurbino is asked to read the statement set forth at the bottom of the waiver form that more completely describes the duties of the parties with regard to waiver of service of the summons. If service is waived after the date provided in the Notice but before Defendant Giurbino has been personally served, the Answer shall be due sixty (60) days from the date on which the request for waiver was sent or twenty (20) days from the date the waiver form is filed, whichever is later.
- 3. No later than **ninety** (90) **days** from the date of this order, Defendants shall file a motion for summary judgment or other dispositive motion with respect to the cognizable claims in the second amended complaint.
- a. If Defendants elect to file a motion to dismiss on the grounds that Plaintiff failed to exhaust his available administrative remedies as required by 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a), Defendants shall do so in an unenumerated Rule 12(b) motion pursuant to *Wyatt v. Terhune*, 315 F.3d 1108, 1119-20 (9th Cir. 2003).

26

27

28